

PA 1618. 512A 217 R. Flaxman
DEFENCE

OF

Mr. Wither's History

K OF

RESISTANCE:

Or, A New

TEST

OF THE

Church of England's LOYALTY.

LONDON:

Printed by R. Tookey, and Sold by J. Roberts in War-
wick Lane, and J. Harrison, near the Royal Exchange.
1715. Price 3d.

2013

DEFENCE

John Widdows's History



RESISTANCE

THE ST

Church of England's Loyalty

LONDON:

Printed by R. Taylor, and Sold by W. Lister in
St. Paul's Church-yard, and at the
1717. Price 2s.

A DEFENCE

OF Mr. WITHERS'S History, &c.

IN all the unhappy Contentions, among Parties and Factions in this brangling Nation, the Champions of the Church of England, as they would have themselves call'd, have laid it down as the distinguishing Mark of their Hierarchy, that it is her Practice, and has been deriv'd from her very Constitution, as well as Doctrine, to fix in all her Members, Principles of unshaken Loyalty to her Prince, entire and undisputed Obedience to all his Commands, and an Abhorrence of the very Thoughts of those Hellish Principles, *That it can be lawful on any Account whatsoever, to resist the establish'd Power of their Kings.*

'Twou'd be endless to quote the Reverend Dr. *Berge*, who from that Text in the *Romans*, Chap. XIII. *v. 1, 2. Resist not the Powers, &c. for whatsoever Powers are, be ordained of God; whosoever therefore resisteth the Power, resisteth the Ordinance of God;* tells us, 'That if the King shou'd by his Royal Command, execute the greatest Violence, upon either our Persons or Estates, our Duty was to submit by Prayers and Tears, first to God Almighty, to turn the Wrath of His Vicegerent from His Servant, and by humble Entreaty to beg his Majesty's Grace and Pardon; but to lift up the Hand against the Lord's Anointed, or resist the Evil of Punishment he thought fit to inflict, this were a Crime unpardonable,

unpardonable either before God or Man, and a Crime (says the Reverend Dr.) which we bless God, the very Principles of our *Ever Loyal Mother*, the Church of *England*, abhors and detests.

Let Incendiaries, Phanatics, and Bloody Peace-breaking Whigs (says another Learned Divine) nourish the Vip'rous Principles of Treason and Rebellion, and let them meet the due Reward of their factious Doings, in the *Rebentments* of a Righteous, but Provok'd Nation: But God be praised, our Mother the Church of *England*, has always brought up her Sons in an unspotted Loyalty and Obedience; none have been found lifting up their Hands against their Sovereign, or possessing the Rights of the anointed of God &c.

The very Being and Life, the Original and Principles of the Church of *England*, (says another 30th of *January* Sermon) is Loyalty and Fidelity to God, as the Immediate Supream, and to the King, as the lively Image of Divine Authority, whose Power is immediately deriv'd from, holds of, and is accountable to none but to God Himself.

To avoid Prolivity of Quotations, the Reader is desired to accept of these as sufficient Proofs of what I lay down, upon this *Condition* nevertheless, that besides the general Appeal which I might make to the Memory of most Men, I oblige my self upon Demand, to produce Ten Thousand full Quotations out of the Writings of our late Modern Authors since the Restoration, where in the Doctrines of Non-resistance of Princes, Passive Obedience, and the Divine Authority of the Kingly Power, is own'd and declar'd to be an Essential Part of the Profession and Practice of the Church of *England*; and upon this Foot, which I hold to be sufficient, I think I can not be confuted if I take it for granted.

Now, as this too much divided Nation has always been compos'd of two contending Parties, those Parties have been distinguished, as in like Cases, by Names of *Contest*; and tho' they have often chang'd them on either side, as *Cavalier* and *Roundhead*, *Royalists* and *Rebels*, *Malignants* and *Phanatics*, *Tories* and *Whigs*, yet the Division has always been barely, the *Church* and *Dissenter*; and there it continues to this Day.

As the Church of England Party have boasted of their own Loyalty; so they have branded the Dissenters with Rebellion and Faction, not only in their Nature, but in their very Principles; they have laid it down in their Writings and Sermons, and Multitudes of their ignorant Hearers believe it, that *the very Doctrine of the Dissenter is made up of Principles, in their own Nature tending to Confusion and Rebellion*; they wont be content that we shou'd own there may be Men among all Parties of bad Designs, and who wou'd on all Occasions embroil their Native Country, but it must be woven with the very Articles of Faith, and that 'tis the Religion of a Dissenter to disturb Government, kill Kings, and oppose Laws.

The Phanatical Enemies of our King and Church (says the Learned Dr. P---n) drink in Rebellion as Water; 'tis the very Substance of their Schismatical Doctrine, to overwhelm and destroy Commonwealths; and Confusions are the Doctrines they preach.

He that lays out one Groat with a Dissenter (says the worthy Sir Roger, in one of his famous *Observations*) contributes just so much as the Profit of that Groat amounts to in Trade, towards the Subversion of Monarchy, and erecting a Commonwealth; for the very Nature and Tendency of their Profession, is destructive of Kingly Power, and the Government of the Nation.

This has been the Opinion of the Church of England, both of themselves on one Hand, and of the Dissenters on the other Hand. I shou'd be glad if I cou'd say, *It has been*, for we find 'tis still too much their Opinion.

Let no Man say, that the Author of these Sheets is either widening or keeping unheal'd the Breaches of this Nation; for if I can make it appear, that there is really no Occasion of such unnatural Divisions, and that neither the extraordinary Opinion of themselves, or the Contempt of their Neighbours, as to the Matter of Loyalty, is a becoming Principle, no, nor a rational one neither, For that as to Loyalty, Passive Obedience, Non-resistance, &c. there is really no great Difference between one side or other; I go as far towards healing the Breach, as any Man; for there can be no better way to end the Strife on both Sides, than to prove that neither Side has any just Cause to contend.

To examine the Matter on both Sides, seems very useful at this time, in order to reconcile Parties, and to settle the Universal Character of the Nation.

The Government of *England* is a limited Monarchy, composed of King, Lords and Commons. Each have their several, their separate, and their conjunctive Powers, which acting in Concert, make the Harmony of the Constitution. I shall not invade the Province of those learned Gentlemen, who have undertaken to set forth the Branches of the Constitution in all their Power, Limitations and Prerogatives: 'Tis enough to say, the Constitution is known, the Government is confin'd by Laws, the Crown limited by Statutes, and the People's Right confirm'd by the Concession of Ages.

To this Government, all Distinction of Names set apart, I am of the Opinion, all Parties have in their Turns been equally Loyal: I was going to say, equally Disloyal: And if I were to use the Language of the late Times, it would be a very proper way of speaking.

Affirming without demonstrating is an absurd way of arguing, and therefore it will be needful to come to Particulars, and to examine the several Acts and Deeds of both Parties when the Kingly Prerogative has shock'd or clash'd with the People.

In order to this, 'tis needful to examine the Date of the Difference, and so to enter a little into History.

Our first Reformation from Popery, was in the Days of King *Edward* the VI. I call it the first, because 'twas under him that the whole Nation and the Government embrac'd the Protestant Reform'd Religion; this Protestant Religion was establish'd by that *Zealous King*, and by his Parliament, back'd with the Force of Laws, and confirm'd by all the Sanction of Authority it was capable of, and here it began to be call'd the Church of *England*.

Some enquiring Christians were for making farther Steps, and carrying on the Reformation to a higher Degree; and if that good reforming King had liv'd, his Zeal and Integrity was such, that there was no doubt he would have gone on to perfect every thing he had begun, as new Light or more Knowledge had encreased; but the Return of Popery under Queen *Mary*, put a Stop to the Work in general, and went very far towards overturning the whole Structure of the Reformation.

Queen

Queen *Elizabeth* restor'd it again; but as she was a Zealous Protestant Queen, yet she was not for subjecting the Reformation to any Amendment. Not that she believ'd it perfect, but she was a Politick Princess, surrounded with Enemies that were not to be dally'd with, and she was loath to suppose such Defects in the Reformation as were alledg'd, because 'twas to lessen the Reputation of it, and consequently her Interest in the World.

Those who insisted upon the further Reformation, were then call'd *Puritans*, because they set up for a greater Purity of Worship, and they separated themselves from the establish'd Church, because, as they said, their Consciences inform'd them, they cou'd serve God more agreeable to his Will.

I shall not meddle with the Arguments made use of on both Sides, either to defend or expose this Principle; 'tis sufficient to acquaint my Reader, that this is the true Original of the Dissenters: We are now to examine a little further back. Before this Reformation there was no such thing as Church of *England*; it was then the Church of *Rome* that was the establish'd National Church.

The Protestants under the title of *Lollards*, *Wicklifsians*, *Hussites*, &c. what did they do? Did they, as our Modern People say every Body shou'd, conform to what the Government commanded? No, the present Church of *England* Party were the Dissenters; the Schismatics and Phanatics, in the Days of King *Henry VIII.* were persecuted for not coming to Church, many of them put to Death, and always treated with Scorn and Contempt, as Enemies to the Government, Broachers of new Opinions, and Contemners of Authority; as in the Case of that famous Proto-Martyr of Christ's Church *John Lambert*, and others.

In the next Ages, these come to have the Power in their Hands, and forgetting that they had found it righteous in the Sight of God, to obey God rather than Man, they treat those whose Consciences oblige them to dissent from them, with the same Contempt, which themselves had receiv'd from the Roman Government.

Thus far they are upon even Terms, as to Obedience to their Superiors-

The Dissenters have the first Occasion after this to show their Submission under extraordinary Pressures. Queen *Elizabeth* discountenanc'd them continually; and as good a Queen as she was, put some of them to Death. King *James I.* hunted them quite out of the Kingdom, made Thousands of them fly into *Holland* and *Germany*, and at last to *New-England*.

During the long Reign of these two Princes, we find no Charge of Treason or Rebellion upon them; they bore the Displeasure of their Princes with Patience and Passive Obedience, if I may be allowed that *Ridiculous Phrase*; being persecuted in one City, they fled to another; they bore illegal Prosecutions, and things contrary to their Right, as *English Men*, but never took up Arms against their Prince.

Under the Reign of King *Charles I.* the Case alter'd, the King and Parliament fell out about Matters of Civil Right, and Invasion of the Liberty and Properties of the People, the *Puritans*, or Dissenters, call them what we please, fell in unanimously with the Parliament.

And here 'tis worthy Remark, that the first Difference between the King and the *English* Parliament, did not respect Religion, but Civil Property; nor were the Majority of the House *Puritans*, but true Church Protestants, and *English Men*; who stood upon the Rights of the People, as *English Men*; and none were more Zealous in the first Disputes, than my Lord *Digby*, Sir *Thomas Wentworth*, and such as were afterwards deep Sufferers for the King.

But the Parliament finding the Puritan Party stuck close to their Cause, they also came over to them, when things came to a Rupture, and so the War begun on the Score of Right, Invasion of Liberty, Breach of the Laws, Private Leagues, and Male Administration; a Game we have seen play'd over again by the very same Church of *England* that have exclaim'd so much against it, so damn'd it, and so damn'd themselves, by Oaths, Declarations, Tests, and God knows what, against it.

'Tis allow'd here, the Puritan broke thro' his Loyalty, and his former Obedience, and fought his Way to the Liberty he demanded. Well, the War ended to his Advantage, he subdued his Sovereign, and brought him to the Block, to the Astonishment of the whole World.

I wont dispute here which or which Party did or did not do it, but to give the Enemy all just Advantage, I am willing to grant it in the largest Sence, that the Dissenters, or Phanaticks, Whigs, call them as you please, did embroe their Hands in the Blood of the Lord's Anointed, put to Death that blessed Martyr, King *Charles the I.* whom a learned Divine, in a Sermon on the 30th of *January*, before the Parliament, compares both in the manner of his Sufferings, and the People by whom, to our Saviour and the *Jews*, and boldly runs on in the Blasphemous Parallel, to shew, that the Indignities and Sufferings of King *Charles*, exceed those of Jesus Christ.

I think I have granted as largely as a fair Adversary can desire; for I have yielded for Peace-sake, to several things which I cou'd fairly disprove.

Nor shall I return to a Repetition of the ill Usage the Dissenters have receiv'd from the contrary Party on this Account for above 30 Years; the constant Reproaches they and their Children after them, have met with from those Gentlemen, who on all Occasions have (as I hinted before) particularly taken care to extol their own unshaken Fidelity to their Prince, till at last an Occasion presents, to touch them in the same most sensible Part, *their Right and Property*; and alas! their Loyalty, what became of it? Truly, the *Faithful, Passively Obedient, Unshakenly Loyal Church*, return'd to the Original Nature of their Neighbours, and did the same thing exactly, which the Whigs, the *Factionous Rebellious Whigs*, had done before.

' No, thats false, (says a Disciple of Dr. *Sherlock's*)
' we did not kill our King, we did not dip our Hands
' in Royal Blood, nor hurt the Lord's Anointed.

No, that's true, but the Lord's Anointed may thank himself for that; for my part I think the Difference only lyes here; the Whigs in 41. to 48. took up Arms against their King; and having conquer'd him, and taken him Prisoner, cut off his Head, *because they had him*. The Church of *England* took Arms against their King in 88. and did not cut off his Head, *because they had him not*. King *Charles* lost his Life *because he did not run away*; and his Son, King *James*, sav'd his Life, *because he did run away*.

'Tis such a Jest, such a Banter, to say, We did take up Arms, but we did not kill him: *Bless us, kill our King, we wou'd not have hurt a Hair of his Head!* Why, every Bullet shot at the Battle of the *Boyne* was a killing the King; for if you did not, 'twas because you cou'd not hit him.

If a Highwayman fires at you upon the Road, when he is taken, and brought upon his Tryal, our learned Recorder, before he pronounces Sentence of Death, harangues him in this manner: *And besides all this, Sir, you are plainly guilty of Murther; for you not only assaulted this honest Man, in order to take away his Money, but you endeavour'd to murther him; for you shot at him, in order to kill him; and the Intention of Murther is equally Criminal in the Eye of God, with the Act it self*

Now, who did we shoot at at the *Boyne*? 'Tis true, King James generally stood out of the way; but who did we shoot at? What! was our Orders to fight against both small and great, and not against the King of Israel? Had your Bullets Commission to shew their Loyalty, and not to touch the Lord's Anointed? If he had chard'd in the first Squadrons of his Horse, had you not kill'd him if you cou'd? I think this needs no further Proof.

Nay, if arguments may be allow'd to have equal Weight on both Sides, the Whigs have been the honestest of the two; for they never profess any such blind, absolute and undisputed Obedience to Princes, as the others have done.

It has always been their Opinion, That Government was originally contrived, by the Consent, and for the mutual Benefit of the Parties Govern'd, that the People have an Original Native Right to their Property, the Liberty of their Persons and Possessions, *unless foresaulted to the Laws*, that they cannot be divested of this Right but by their own Consent; and that all Invasion of this Right, is destructive of the Constitution: and Compact of Government and Obedience.

They have always declar'd, That they understand their Allegiance to their Governors to be, *supposing they govern them according to the Laws of the Land*; and that if Princes break this Bond of Government, the Nature of it is inverted, and the Constitution ceases of course.

Bucchanan

Buchanan in Scotland, Algernoon Sidney in England, have set their Names, and the latter his Blood, to this Doctrine, and the Author of the True-born Englishman is worth quoting in the Case.

*The Government's ungirt when Justice dies,
And Constitutions are Non-Entities:
The Nation's all a Mob, there's no such thing
As Lords or Commons, Parliament or King:
A great promiscuous Crowd the Hydra lyes,
Till Laws revive, and mutual Contract ties:
A Chaos free to chuse for their own Share,
What Case of Government they please to wear.
If to a King they do the Reins commit,
All Men are bound in Conscience to submit;
But then that King must by his Oath assent
To Postulata's of the Government.
Which if he breaks, he cuts off the Entail,
And Power retreats to its Original.*

True-born Englishman, P. 74.

This has been the avow'd Doctrine of the Dissenters, and is indeed the true Sence of the Constitution it self; pursuant to this Doctrine they thought they had a Right to oppose Violence with Force; believing that when Kings break Coronation Oaths, the Solemn Compact with their People, and encroach upon their Civil Rights, contrary to the Laws of the Land, by which they are sworn to Rule; they cease to be the Lord's Anointed any longer, the Sanction of their Office is vanish'd, and they become Tyrants and Enemies of Mankind; and may be treated accordingly,

Now 'tis no wonder to find People of these Principles vigorously withstanding their Governors, when they tread upon the tender sore Places of the Constitution; 'tis nothing but what they all along pretended to, and declar'd to be their Opinion.

But to find the Church of England-Men, whose Loyalty has been the Subject of a Thousand Learned Authors and numberless Sermons, whose whole Character and Mark of Distinction has been chosen more for her steady Adherence and Fidelity to her Prince, than to God Almighty; whose Obedience to her Monarch has been declar'd

declar'd to be Inviolable and Immovable; and who pretends to be Famous thro' the whole World for her Faithfulness to Kings; *for her*, as soon as ever the King did but, as it were, seem to aim at crushing her Authority, as soon as he did but begin to call her Clergy to an Account, and clap up her *Golden Candlesticks* for Disobedience; *for her* to winch and kick, fly to foreign Princes for Protection, and rise in Arms against her Prince, O *Pelin!* O *Brady!* O *Sherlock!* O *Hominem!* O *Mores!*

Where's the worthy Dr. *B——ge's* Loyalty now? His Immovable Loyalty, that after all his Absolute Submission, is so far from being a Martyr to his own Doctrine, that he cou'd not lose a small Benefice for it?

Where is the Famous Dr. *S——k?* Who having stood out long in his old antiquated Doctrine of Passive Obedience, and confirmed the Faith of his suffering Brethren, by strong and wonderful Arguments, at last, at the powerful Instigation of a Wife, and a good Sallary, *has Sold all his Loyalty for a Mess of Portage*, solving his Honesty with the wretched Distinction of a Power *De Facto*, and a Power *De Jure*, as if the Church of *England's* Credit could be saved by such an impotent Shift; or as if he could make amends to the Prebendary for his helping him to Sacrifice his Brethren, to Father his Conversion upon reading honest Dr. *Overall*, whose Doctrine, it is well known, the Doctor knew before; but that he was loth Dr. *South* should have the Honour of bringing him over to such Old Phanatick Principles?

Behold the Loyalty of the Church of *England!* now let us examine their Conscience, as to taking Oaths; and if I do not bring them to be all Whigs, and *Forty-One-Men*; or else prove them all perjured, then I do nothing.

The Clergy, all the Magistrates and Officers of the Household, of the Civil or Military Government, were Members of the Church of *England*, otherwise they could not be employed; the Sacramental Test has done the Dissenters this Kindness, that it is plain, all the managing Hands in the Kingdom were Disciples of the Church; and as an additional Circumstance, the Oath of Allegiance which they took, and which was (God be praised)

praised) of their own making, bound them to that same absolute blind Obedience which they profest, and confined it to the King, his Heirs and Successors.

If this Oath be considered literally, I am content to be silenced, when one fair Argument can be brought to evade it; the Declaration followed it, wherein they detest and abhor that devilish Doctrine, that it is lawful *on any Pretence whatsoever*, (*Mark the Emphasis*) to take up Arms against the King; this (*equal to an Oath*) is declared in the Presence of God; and the Particulars being material to our Purpose, are as follows:

I A. B. do declare and believe that it is not lawful upon any Pretence whatsoever, to take up Arms against the King; and that I do abhor that Traiterous Position of taking Arms by his Authority, against those that are commissioned by him.

So help me God.

Notwithstanding this, you have taken up Arms against, deposed, and as far as you were able, put to Death your lawful King, the very King you swore Allegiance to.

Now, pray Gentlemen, give Commission to some worthy Champion of your Churches Loyalty, to bring you fairly off of your Oath and Declaration if you can; and till you do, be not angry with us for making one of these Conclusions from the Premises, and you shall chuse for yourselves.

First, That this Doctrine of Absolute, Passive and Non-resistant Obedience, is an Absurdity in it self, contradictory to the Nature of Government and Allegiance, and politically introduced by State Engines into the Church of *England*, to abuse her, and betray her Members into unforeseen Mischiefs and Inconveniences.

Or, *Secondly*, That the Members of the Church of *England* are all Apostates from the very Fundamental Doctrine of their Church; perjured in the Sight of God and Man, notorious Hypocrites and Deceivers, who having sworn Obedience without Reserve to their Prince, are become Traytors, Rebels, and Murtherers of the Lord's Anointed, and their Lawful Sovereign; and not having the Fear of God before their Eyes, have deposed and traiterously dethroned their Rightful King, God Almighty's

Almighty's Vicegerent, accountable to no Earthly Power, Supreme under God, Absolute, and from Divine Institution, Undoubted, Sole Lord of them and their Country.

Or, *Lastly*, That they only are the true Church of *England*, who according to their avowed Profession, have firmly adhered to their King in all his Sufferings and Solitude, have never blackened their Consciences, nor gone back from their Obedience, forgotten their Oaths, nor sullied their Reputation with the horrid Crimes of Treason and Rebellion, as they think it to be.

Now, as a fair Disputant, I am willing the Respondent shall chuse which of these three Consequences he will stand, by in Behalf of the Church of *England's* Loyalty; but if they would take the Advice of a *Friend to the honest Part of them*, I would recommend the first Conclusion to be fittest for them, for the following Reasons.

1. Because since Humane Infallibility is (*and with good Reason*) disowned by the Church of *England*, both for herself and every Body else, it can be no Diminution to her Reputation, when she has found herself mistaken and impos'd upon, to acknowledge her Error; *a wise Man will always own, rather than defend a Mistake.*

2. Because 'tis my Opinion that their Way is hedged up against any other Pretence, Evasion or Reservation, and therefore it is with me the only thing that Charity can say for them, and must remain so, till I find something else said that is more to the Purpose.

But the Mischief of all is, that if this be honestly acknowledged (*as is doubtless most true*) that the Church of *England* was mistaken, and imposed upon, to espouse a senseless absurd Principle, contrary to the Nature of Government and Allegiance, &c. why then they come over to this Conclusion.

That Government and Allegiance are both conditional, and Oaths of Subjects are always to be considered in a constructive Sense, with Conditions of Protection, and the like, a Thing which is without Question the real Meaning of all Oaths of Allegiance; otherwise Subjects may be put under an absolute Necessity of Perjury or State Martyrdom, by often swearing what may be impossible for them to perform.

The

The Town of *Aeth*, in *Flanders*, has been about six Times, and the Town of *Rhinebergh* in *Gueldre* about twelve Times, taken and retaken; and as often as new Masters had Possession of the Place, so often the poor Inhabitants have sworn to their new Lords: What can the meaning of such an Oath be, but that they will be faithful to them so long as they keep Possession of the Place? 'Twould be ridiculous to imagine the Imposers of the Oath required any more.

If our zealous *Churchmen* worded an Oath contrary to the very Nature of swearing Allegiance, let them answer for it who first made it, then took it, then broke it: But the Nature of the Thing, can leave Room for no other Suggestion that I know of.

Till then some further Argument is produced, it must rest here, that the *Church* of *England* was Mistaken, imposed upon, &c. that she finds when the Laws are Broken, the Right of the People Invaded, the Root of the Government struck at, *Church* and *State* undermined, and despotick Tyranny at the Door, the Native Right of the People is Superior, and they may assume a Power to Right themselves.

And so we are brought back to Whiggism and Forty One: And, Gentlemen, there is no Remedy for it, help it if ye can.

Where now is the Difference between *Church-Loyalty*, and *Whiggish-Loyalty*, *Roundhead* or *Cavalier*, *Churchman* or *Dissenter*, *Whig* or *Tory*? All are alike; they are pleased, when legally governed; quarrellsome and unruly if oppress'd; and will defend themselves if assaulted, though it be by their Kings, or any Body else.

Why then is the Difference kept up? Methinks they might all be Friends together, for they are all alike; the Dissenters have been in their times, as Loyal, and the *Church* of *England* in their time as Disloyal as one another. *Vice versa*; the Dissenters have been as Disloyal, and the *Churchmen* as Loyal as one another upon the same Occasion; they have been both Sufferers, and have submitted to the Government; ay, and to the Oppressions and Persecutions of their Superiors and Sovereigns; and again, upon the like Occasions, they have both of them been Rebels, if their own Language may be so far used; they have, both of them, in their Turn, taken Arms against, and deposed their Rightful and Lawful Kings. So

So that in my Opinion, *with a Latitude to all that think otherwise, to think as they please*, the Church of *England*, and their Neighbours the Dissenters, have nothing to quarrel with one another about, as to Loyalty; as to other Matters I have nothing to say to them, nor shall not mingle it with this Discourse.

Nor do I think I am writing a Satyr against the Church of *England*, nor is it at all intended to be so; and to stop all Pretences that way, I take the Freedom to say, here has been no Crime, the Church of *England* has been in the right of it, not in taking Arms; but the Error was in espousing, crying up, and pretending to a blind, absolute Obedience to Princes, be their Commands never so Absolute, Tyrannical or Illegal; this neither the Doctrine nor Practice of the Church of *England*, nor of any Church or People in the Christian World, ever pretended to; and therefore the Fault lay in those People, who being themselves Members of the Church of *England*, suffer'd themselves to be deluded by State-Ministers, to foster a Tenent upon the Church, which her Original Constitution never pretended to, and then call it the Doctrine of the Church of *England*.

The first beginning of their pretended Doctrine was found in *Manwaring's* and *Sibthorp's* Libels, in the Days of King *Charles I.* cajoling the King, and then to please him, endeavouring to wheedle the People into a Belief of the Divine Right of Kingly Government; and affirming, that the King was not obliged by the Laws in the Administration of the Government.

Upon this preposterous Foundation they built the Illegitimate Structure of absolute, undisputed Obedience; for if Kingly Power were once proved to be immediately derived from Divine Authority, Absolute Obedience would be a Consequence no Body could Dispute, since the same Obedience without Reserve would be due to the delegated Power, as to the Power Delegating.

And tho' this is a Point easily enough confuted, yet being willing to keep the present Dispute within as small a Compass as we can, I think our Argument has nothing at all to do with it.

Whether Government be of Divine Original or not, seems not the Question here; for if it be not so, then, as before, the Church of *England* have been Mistaken and imposed

imposed upon; and if it be so, then the Church of England has trampled under Foot their own Doctrine, turn'd Rebels to God, and Apostates from the Faith they have profess'd, have Sacrilegiously and Traite-rously taken up Arms against their Prince, assaulted the Lord's Anointed, *resisted the Powers which are the Ordinance of God*, deposed their Lawful Sovereign, broken their Allegiance, and consequently *are a Parcel of perjur'd Rebels*; every Jot as bad as the worst Roundhead Regicide, and Rebel of the Year Forty One.

What more or less can be said, I profess I know not, and am in great Expectation of something new in the Matter; for I cannot find in all the Writings I have met with, any Thing to contradict it.

The bringing Government and Obedience to the proper Circumstances of mutual Compact between King and People, seems to me to be the only Method to unravel this Skein of entangl'd Principles; the Nature of Government has made it the necessary Consequence of all Argument relating to Power; and I cou'd give Instances in all the Nations in the World, that some time or other, even the Right of Succession to Government, *which must be as sacred as the Power*, has been interrupted and limited by the People, in Case of Tyranny and Illegal Governing; and every Nation, *and this among the rest*, has oftentimes depos'd their Princes for the Preservation of the State, when either Incapacity for Government, Tyrannical Usurpation, or other Male-Administration, has been the Case.

But this I think also needless here; every one that is vers'd in History can read the numerous Examples in the Roman, Grecian and Persian Histories, *even Sacred Histories, where Kings were more particularly of Divine Right than any where*, are full of them; the Histories of Spain, Portugal, France, Lombardy, the Empires of Germany and Muscovy, even the Papal

C

Chair,

Chair, have suffer'd Convulsions and Revolutions, the Deposing and Displacing their Sovereigns, when the People's Good, *which is, and ever was, the Soul, the Center, the End, and the Cause of all Government,* came to be in the Dispute.

But to return to the Principles of the Two Parties we are now discoursing of; the Whigs, as before, have always asserted this to be their Notion of Government and Governors; and the Church of England, *however some among them have kept an empty Notion upon them, have all along, and now at last once for all, own'd it by their Practice,*

*That Kings, when they descend to Tyranny,
Dissolve the Bond, and leave the Subject free.*

True-born Eng. Man, Page 47.

The Act for the further Limitation of the Crown, past in the last Parliament, and the Right of the People therein declar'd and recogniz'd, I wou'd ask my Opponent whose Act and Deed it was? Will they say it was a Whiggish Act, made by a Phantical House of Commons? *I dare say there was not Ten Dissenters in the House;* let them descend with us into Particulars, let them draw out a *Black List* of Members, who in that Loyal Honest English Parliament gave their Hands to the last Settlement and Declaration of Right, and let us tell *Noses*, and put a Brand upon the *Phanaticks* among them.

Will they tell us it was a *Phantical Parliament*, that set the Crown upon the Queen's Head? I hope they will own Her Majesty and their Lordships the Bishops are part of the Church of England; for if the Head and the principal Members are not, we know not who are.

Will they tell us that Sir E. S. Sir B. S. Sir J. B. Mr. H—y, Sir C—r M—ve, and a Hundred more of that Side, where Whigs and Commonwealth-men?
How

How comes it to pass in *England*, that no Papist can inherit? *Divine Right* ought to supercede all Precautions, and the young Prince of Savoy, not the *House of Hanover*, ought to reign with a *Non Obstante* to all Humane Limitation, if all was from Heaven: Where are our Right-Line-Men now! Why, truly the Reason is plain, the *Church of England*, *People of England*, a *Church of England*, *Parliament of England*, have thought fit to declare, that for the good of the People, to which all *Right of Succession to Power* must give way, because from them all Power it self does derive, and by the Voice of that People (in which Authority sufficient is Legally Grounded) it is unanimously agreed, that we will not have a Papist to Reign over us.

All this is too plain to admit of a Dispute; and now to me it seems Preposterous why any Men shou'd keep up the Distinction between Parties as to Loyalty, when indeed there is no manner of Difference in the Case.

I have talk'd several times of Bearing, Suffering, being persecuted and oppress'd, as the Dissenters in their time have been more than enough, and again, in their Turn, the *Church of England* have been persecuted too: For, as I noted before, they were once the *Schismatics*, the *Whigs*, and the *Dissenters*. Now I think 'tis not very foreign to my Argument to examine whether of the Two behav'd themselves under their Sufferings with the greatest Submission, who shou'd most absolute Obedience to their Superiors, and who first, or oftneft rebell'd against their Lawful Sovereign.

The Protestants under *Henry VIII.* were the first Dissenters; they were kept under, persecuted, and put to Death, as Rebels and *Schismatics*. Now upon due Search it will be found, that under the Protection of Two Protestant Queens, Wives of King *Henry VIII.* they had more than once form'd such Interest at Court, and in the Kingdom, as to begin

begin to be formidable to the Popish Powers then Reigning; and the Fall of the Lord *Cromwell* was thought a necessary Policy in King *Henry*, to prevent the Plots of the *Phanatical Church of England Hereticks*; a long Account of which may be read in the Life of that Prince.

King *Edward VI.* a zealous and pious Prince, made no Scruple for the Propagation of the Protestant Church of *England*, of which he was the Glorious Founder, to set Aside the Lawful and Undisputed Succession of his own Sisters, to establish the Crown in the Lady *Jane Grey*, who he knew wou'd carry on the Work of Reformation.

There's an Instance of the Zeal for Succession in the Right Line, in the first Protestant Head that ever the Church of England had.

After this, the Gospellers, that is, the Church of *England Protestants* of *Suffolk*, having some Sence of Injury done to the Princess *Mary*, and willing to have the Succession go on in the Right Line, provided they cou'd both preserve their Religion and Loyalty too; capitulate with her, and promise to stand by her, provided she would promise to preserve and make no Alteration in their Establish'd Church of *England*.

Here the Church of *England* Men own'd the Liberty of their Religion to be superior to their Loyalty to her; and that they had a Right to submit, or not to submit, as their Liberty was, or was not, secure; and accordingly condition'd with her, before they wou'd acknowledge her to be their Queen.

And we see how Heaven punish'd them for venturing on the Word of a Prince, when their Religion and Liberty was at Stake.

In this Queen's Time the Church having been again suppress'd, and Popery erected, Sir *Thomas Wyatt*, an honest Church of *England* Protestant, with a very good Body of Men, took up Arms against

against their Lawful Prince, for breaking her Word, in Defence of *their Dear Religion, establish'd by blessed King Edward*, which were the very Words of the Manifesto they publish'd: The *Londoners*, with 800 Men, sent by the Queen against them, thought it no Treachery to Desert their Lawful Popish Queen, and go over to their *Protestant Church of England Brethren*.

We have nothing to do with the Justification of this Fact; 'tis sufficient that so it was, and that these were *Protestants* of the Church of *England*, in the first and purest part of their *Principles*, and let them justify the Fact if they please.

Queen *Elizabeth* succeeds, and then the Church of *England* shone in its Meridian Glory, and then grew up some, who aiming, *as I said before*, at a further Reformation; and the Church refusing to hearken to it, form'd a new *Party of Dissenters*, and these were call'd *Puritans*, and since that *Phanaticks*.

Now I challenge the Defender of this Cause to tell me one Disloyal Act, one Plot against the Government, one Disturbance of the civil Peace, among these Dissenters, from the beginning of this Queen, which was their own beginning, to the Reign of King *Charles I.* which was a continu'd Term of 80 Years, and yet, during this Time, they suffer'd all manner of Indignities, Reproaches, Fines, Imprisonings, Banishment, Confiscations, and Corporal Punishments.

So that hitherto the Passive-Obedience of the Dissenters hath far exceeded that of the Church of *England*. These had but Five Years Oppression under Queen *Mary*, and in that Five Years they once Capitulated with their Sovereign to make her Queen upon Conditions, and once took Arms against her, after she was Queen, and by that I must always understand, that if they did not depose and destroy her, it was because they cou'd not; and if they had done it, no doubt they had Cause sufficient to justify them before

before God and Man. The Puritans after this suffer'd all that their too cruel Brethren of the Church of *England* laid upon them, during Three tedious Reigns, before they so much as made the least Offer at doing themselves Justice; and for Eighty Years together exercis'd their Passive-Obedience, which they never pretended too.

At last they took Arms; and when they did, they did it to Purpose, carried all before them, subdued Monarchy, cut off their King's Head, and *all that*.

After the Restoration, Things began to Return to their old Channel, and Thirty Years more the Dissenters endur'd another Egyptian Servitude, were persecuted, plunder'd, indicted, imprison'd, plagu'd with Impositions, Stigmatiz'd with a Thousand Reproaches; their Meeting-houses Demolish'd, their Estates Confiscated, their Persons Excommunicated, and Anathematiz'd, Sworn into Plots they never heard of, and into Crimes they never Committed, Dragg'd to Goals, Gibbets and Scaffolds, and the like. *All this while Passive Obedience, if there were any such thing,* was found among them more than any where else; for here was no Rebellion, no Insurrection, nor breaking of the Peace by the Dissenters notwithstanding all these Oppositions.

After this comes King *James* the Second to the Crown, and he turn'd the Scale, and, together with Invasion of Liberty, falls upon the Church, begins to Rifle her of her Trophies, *for no Essentials had been touch'd,* and how long did she bear it? Not Eighty Years, nor Thirty Years, no, not so many Months.

What did she do? Truly nothing but what she ought to have done; Defend her Liberty and Religion by Force, against Unjust Invasion and Tyranny, nothing but what all the Nations in the World have done, and wou'd do again if they cou'd.

The only Error we Charge upon the Church of *England*, was setting up Pretences of what they really

really wou'd not Practice, crying up themselves for Fools, when we knew they were wiser Men, calling themselves humble Slaves, but when the Tryal came, proving Stubborn, Refractory, *Liberty-Mongers*, even as bad as the worst *Whig* or *Phanatick* of them all.

For the future, then if a humble Moderator might be permitted to give Advice to the Gentlemen of the Church of *England*, it shou'd be in these short and friendly Terms.

Pray Gentlemen never be impos'd upon, to pretend to more Loyalty and more slavish Principles than you intend to Practice.

Never pretend to more Obedience than your Sovereign Requires. Our late King *William*, who I am not asham'd to show as a Patern for future Ages, requir'd; and his present Majesty, *without Affront to his Majesty's Authority it may be said*, requires no further Obedience from the People of *England*, than the Laws of *England* requires.

To govern according to Law, is a full Satisfaction to the People, and to obey according to Law, is a full Satisfaction to the Sovereign. The Laws are the Test both of the Royal Authority, and of the Subjects Obedience; and to pretend to more Obedience than the Law requires, is abusing your Prince, and abusing your selves.

Never be asham'd to own with your Brethren the *Whigs*, that you are willing to submit to Authority, but that you expect to be govern'd according to the *Laws* and *Statutes* of this *Realm*.

Let the Scotch Motto be set upon your Liberties, and according to your constant Practice, as well as ours: Let all Men know you Design to make it Good. *Nemo me Impune Laceffit.*

And

